

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION

ATTMOND D. CHANDLER

§

§

VS.

§

CIVIL NO. 4:21-CV-980-P

§

COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION

§

§

ORDER RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL
AND RETURNING CASE TO DISTRICT JUDGE

On August 19, 2021, *pro se* Plaintiff Atmond D. Chandler filed a complaint in the above-styled and numbered cause. The Court, also on August 19, 2021, issued an order titled “Instructions to a Non-Prisoner *Pro Se* Plaintiff,” which stated, *inter alia*, that, unless excused for cause or the presiding judge directs otherwise, Plaintiff was to register as an Electronic Case Files (“ECF”) user within 14 days. Thereafter, on November 10, 2021, the undersigned issued an order requiring Plaintiff to comply with Local Civil Rules 5.1(e) & (f) by registering an email address and registering as an ECF user no later than November 24, 2021. Then, after Plaintiff once again failed to comply, the Court, on November 30, 2021, issued an Order to Show Cause that ordered Plaintiff to show cause, in writing, no later than Tuesday, December 14, 2021, as to why he had not complied with the November 10, 2021 order. As of the date of this order, Plaintiff has wholly failed to comply with all the above-listed Court orders. Consequently, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that the above-styled and numbered cause be **DISMISSED** for failing to comply with the Court’s orders.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to this action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within fourteen (14) days after the party has been served with a copy of this document. The United States District Judge need only make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to file, by the date stated above, a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

ORDER

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is hereby **ORDERED** that each party is granted until **December 30, 2021** to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. It is further **ORDERED** that if objections are filed and the opposing party chooses to file a response, the response shall be filed within seven (7) days of the filing date of the objections.

It is further **ORDERED** that the above-styled and numbered action, previously referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for findings, conclusions and recommendation, be and hereby is returned to the docket of the United States District Judge.

SIGNED December 16, 2021.



JEFFREY L. CURETON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE